

face-to-face meeting with the Postmaster General of this country, so that as elected representatives of the people we can sit down and express directly to the Postmaster General what our concerns are, and to seek from the Postmaster General guarantees and assurances that the people that we represent, the small American companies and these American workers, will not have to pay this heavy price in terms of job loss. So I close my remarks by saying that it is my intention within the next few days to approach other Members of this body and to ask them to join me in this effort as we carry on these discussions with the Postal Service.

#### U.S. POSITION IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I was asked to go to Bosnia with 14 other Members of the United States Congress here to ascertain for our colleagues here what America's position should be in that war-torn country. I was honored to go there.

The first day we flew over to Serbia and met with President Milosevic and his people, and the second day we went to Croatia and met with President Tudjman and his folks. The third day we flew into Sarajevo, and not since I had been an 18-year-old kid walking around the hills of Korea with the First Division had I witnessed such devastation in a country.

□ 1700

We landed at the airport, and guards picked us up at the edge of the airport property. They began to take us through town. People lived in burned-out buildings and shells and bunkers and basements, anywhere they could live. Eighty-six percent of the water supply was gone in the city. Very little food was getting in except through the United Nations.

But I noticed as our bus was traveling under heavy security throughout state of Sarajevo, people began running up from the bunkers and clapping, because they understood that there were 15 United States Congressmen visiting their country who were going to have something to say about their future.

We eventually prevailed upon security to let us stop in a little square where just a few months before a mortar round from the surrounding mountainside had killed 57 people. The security said, no one will come out and talk to you. They are too afraid. But by the time we got off the bus, every street filtering into that little square was filled with hundreds of people rushing to the square to surround our bus.

This one elderly gentleman, in the press of that crowd, grabbed me by the arm and said something to me that made such an indelible imprint upon

my mind I have never forgotten it to this day. He said to me, after telling me that he had lost every member of his family, his wife was gone, his brothers and sisters, his children, he was alone in the world, he said to me, with tears streaming down his eyes, Congressman, do you not understand that we only trust America? We only trust America.

In the press of the crowd, I did not think too much about his words. We got back on the bus and went to our appointed rounds, and as we were flying up to Germany to see the troops, I began to think about the words of that old man. Some things in this business you know innately in the gut.

He was not saying to me, Congressman, we only trust America's military prowess, or America's economic strength. What he was saying to me was, Congressman, we only trust the experience of America.

We live here in a multiracial, multi-ethnic, multireligious society, and because we have chosen not to tolerate each other's differences, we have killed or maimed 200,000 of our people beyond repair.

But we know America, and we know the message of America to all of the world, because you are like us. You came from every corner of the world, with different values, different cultures, different ethnicity, different religions. But for some reason or another, not perfectly so, you have made it work better than anybody else in the world, because you tolerate the differences among you. We trust you.

Two weeks to the day after I left that old man in the streets of Sarajevo, I stood before a college class of 25 21-year-old students in this country, who, one by one, rose and looked me square in the eye and said to me in no uncertain terms, Congressman, we do not trust any of you people. You are all in it for the special interests.

Mr. Speaker, to restore the trust in this country between the Representative and the represented, we must enact campaign finance reform to restore confidence from our own children and our government here.

#### TIME FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM TO BE BROUGHT TO THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] for an incredibly moving statement, and thank him for his support of campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, people watching the House of Representatives today should be clear about what has happened here. As we speak right now, leaders of the Republican Party and members of the Republican Party are flying to New York City in private jets to attend a

fund-raising dinner. It is not even 5 o'clock, and yet we have stopped doing the legislative business for this day. The fact is that raising money is more important to the Republican Party than finishing the work that we have before us.

We are not finishing a number of important bills to make sure that government does not close at the end of this month, as we recall it closed twice in 1995 and 1996. The fact is that we have one very important piece of legislation that is not yet resolved, but which we have been repeatedly told there is just not enough time to consider. I am talking about campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have been demanding for this entire year that Speaker GINGRICH schedule time on the House floor for a measure that would reform our corrupt campaign finance laws and ban soft money. The term "soft money" refers to large contributions to political parties that are not supposed to help elect candidates, but really do.

Some soft money has some very real impact. It comes in a variety of sizes, \$25,000, \$50,000, \$250,000, and most recently even \$1 million from a single individual or organization. We want to ban soft money because we believe it has distorted our democracy. We believe that public policy has become for sale to the highest bidder, and we believe that is wrong.

But the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NEWT GINGRICH] thinks it is more important to go to New York for a fund-raiser than to stay in Congress and work on legislation that will make our election laws more secure and protected from the influence of special interest money. Apparently there is time to go to New York to raise money for the Republican Party, but there is no time to stay here and work to perfect our democracy, and work to reduce the influence of special interest money, and ban soft money.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by this decision. I am deeply troubled by it, and I can imagine many Americans are troubled as well. The Speaker once said, we should clean this system up. In fact, over 2 years ago, many Members will remember, he shook hands with President Clinton in New Hampshire over a pledge to reform campaign finance laws, a pledge to the American people.

Do Members know what reforms have been implemented in that time? None. The Speaker has done nothing in 28 months to clean up our campaign finance laws, but he has continued to raise record amounts of money, and continues to believe that what American democracy needs is more money in politics, not less.

The fact is, money has simply overwhelmed our democracy. Too many decisions today in Congress are made based upon whether or not contributions were received with regard to a particular issue. It is not just whether

issues are brought to the floor for a vote, it is also the issues that are not brought to the floor for a vote.

Health care reform, labor protections, minimum wage increases, these issues are hard to raise in Congress, in part because of the narrow interests that have fed the political machine with cold, hard cash. Money in politics affects everything lawmakers do in Washington, even our health and our safety.

For example, the meat institute and the grocery manufacturers reportedly spent over \$300,000 in the 1996 elections, and today they are actively lobbying against new proposed meat inspection standards in the wake of the E. coli concerns that all Americans share.

Then there is the infamous \$50 billion tax break for the tobacco industry in the recent balanced budget and tax agreement approved by Speaker GINGRICH and TRENT LOTT, \$50 billion of taxpayers' money given away in the middle of the night. Do Members think it is a coincidence that the tobacco companies are among the largest contributors to political parties and Members of Congress? I do not.

Despite the overwhelming evidence that this system needs to be changed, the leadership in Congress refuses to allow us to have a vote on a bill to reform our campaign finance reform laws. If we are serious about reform, there is still time to ban soft money in the upcoming 1998 elections. That is what I believe we should do, but we cannot get a vote on the House floor to do that. Again, we cannot do it because they say there is no time. Clearly there is time, because as we see, most Republicans have left this Chamber today early to go to New York for a fundraiser.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue and my colleagues will continue to call on Speaker GINGRICH to schedule a vote this month on a ban on soft money, and to restore the will of the people to the House of the people. Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to this vote, and the American people are entitled to this vote.

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE ARMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say thank you to my colleagues, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON], for the opportunity to join with them this evening from the Women's Caucus to discuss an important issue, which is sexual harassment in the Army's ranks; more importantly, what the Army is doing about this sexual harassment.

The Army released its report on the extent of sexual harassment in its ranks last Thursday. I commend the

Army for conducting and for making public this extensive review of the circumstances that have led to sexual misconduct at Aberdeen Proving Ground and at other Army installations throughout the Nation. This review hammers home the need for fairness, fairness in our armed services.

According to the findings of the review, 78 percent of women in the Army have experienced crude or offensive behavior, 47 percent have received unwanted sexual attention, and 15 percent have experienced actual sexual coercion. This is a mind-boggling number of women, women who have chosen to serve their Nation in the Army, who are being sexually harassed or even assaulted.

This kind of treatment is intolerable anywhere in society, and it is particularly disturbing to find it so prevalent in our Armed Forces, from people whose mission it is to stand up for justice, not to promote inequality or discrimination.

It is important to note that while the spotlight of harassment has focused on women, and certainly that is a tremendous problem, the review also shows that men have also been subject to uneven treatment. Seventy-six percent of men questioned said they had experienced crude or offensive behavior, 30 percent have received unwanted sexual attention, and 8 percent have been subject to coercion.

The Army's review states that the U.S. Army lacks commitment, it lacks commitment to its equal opportunity program. Soldiers sometimes do not even receive sexual harassment training until they are 3 or 4 months into their service. Even more disturbing, once soldiers receive the training, there is no strong enforcement of the rules.

Harassment complaints are, and I quote from the Inspector General's report, "generally not processed in accordance with . . . timeliness standards. Required complaint feedback is frequently not provided. Required investigation extensions are generally not done for cases exceeding regulatory timeliness. Required follow-up is generally not conducted to ensure corrective action is taken following investigation."

Most importantly, the Army lacks commitment among its young drill sergeants to teach respect as a core army value. Drill sergeants exercise total power over their charges. They have a tremendous responsibility to exercise that power wisely and fairly, and the Army has a responsibility to see that they do so.

In the past the Army has served as a shining example to the rest of the country by leading the way in desegregation. I hope that the Army will live up to its tradition of fairness by instituting policy changes that will ensure that every member of the service is treated with fairness and with dignity.

While sensitivity training is important, it needs to go further. We need to

know if the findings of this report reflect a trend throughout all branches of the military. We need to institute policies to ensure that the strong regulations and procedures which are already in place will be put into practice. Women must know that their complaints will be acted on so they will not need to be afraid to report misconduct. We need to ensure that all of our soldiers are treated with fairness and with equality.

Women serve our country with great distinction and honor throughout the ranks of all of the branches of our armed services. They play an essential role in our Armed Forces. They should be able to do so without discrimination or fear of violence of any kind.

#### EDUCATION SHOULD BE AMERICA'S NUMBER ONE PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as a Democrat who believes strongly that education should be this Nation's and this Congress' number one priority, I have found the past week's debate most disturbing and frustrating.

What could be more important to our children's future than providing them with a world-class education? Nothing. So why does the majority party continue to cut and cut and cut the education budget? Why do they continue to block old and positive initiatives aimed at improving the quality of education for all our kids?

□ 1715

In the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts, the district that I represent, we have children going to classes in buildings in desperate need of repair. There are school buildings in my district that were built when Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States.

Now, Democrats applauded President Clinton earlier this year when he proposed \$5 billion for school construction that would help local communities leverage up to \$20 billion for school construction and repairs. One-third of American schools need extensive repair, and I bet they are not all in Democratic districts. But what happened to that proposal? Why did that proposal not become law? Well, the Republican majority killed it in the budget deal.

So let us talk about priorities for a moment. What are the priorities of the Republican majority in this Congress? Well, the Republicans said that \$5 billion for school construction was too much money to spend on education. We just do not have that kind of money, they said; and yet many of us were absolutely outraged to learn that those same Members, in the very dead of night, secretly inserted into the budget